



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,283	11/06/2006	Kassem Ghorayeb	94.0052	3037
48879	7590	08/18/2011		
SCHLUMBERGER INFORMATION SOLUTIONS			EXAMINER	
5599 SAN FELIPE			ALHJ/A, SAII A	
SUITE 1700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HOUSTON, TX 77056-2722			2128	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/18/2011	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jalverson@slb.com  
jforward@slb.com  
sthompson9@slb.com

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-4 and 6-20 have been presented for examination.

Claim 5 has been cancelled.

**Response to Arguments**

2. The reply filed on 2 June 2011 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s):

Applicants response does not address several of the previously presented rejections. Specifically Applicants appear to attempt to argue the combination of references on page 17 of their remarks however the arguments merely recite "What is not clear, is how these true things apply to the claim elements" which follows Applicants agreeing with the Examiner as to the characterization of the prior art combination. It appears that the merits of the rejection being argued have not been presented by Applicants. Further Applicants argue on page 18 of their remarks that the claims do not recite a standalone controller. The Examiner notes that claims 1 and 14 have been amended to omit the "controller" that is argued so it is unclear what specific arguments pertain to independent claims 1 and 14. Further Applicants argue that the references do not recite "synchronizes these simulators under a variable time step that the controller chooses that allows the simulators to progress with their own times steps using their own 3D grid cell models." The Examiner notes that the claims do not recite "3D grid cell models" and independent claims 1 and 14 do not recite a controller so it is unclear what specific arguments pertain to independent claims 1, 2, and 14. The Examiner further respectfully suggests Applicants review their recitation of time steps since following the omission of the term controller preceding time step it is unclear what time steps are being argued in their remarks.

As per 37 CFR 1.111 (b) Applicants are required to:

(b) **In order to be entitled to reconsideration or further examination, the applicant or patent owner must reply to the Office action. The reply by the applicant or patent owner must be reduced to a writing which distinctly and specifically points out the supposed errors in the examiner's action and must reply to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action. The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. If the reply is with respect to an application, a request may be made**

that objections or requirements as to form not necessary to further consideration of the claims be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated. The applicant's or patent owner's reply must appear throughout to be a bona fide attempt to advance the application or the reexamination proceeding to final action. A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section.

See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

### Conclusion

3. All Claims are rejected.
4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SAIF A. ALHIJA whose telephone number is (571)272-8635. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 11:00-7:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah can be reached on (571) 272-2279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. *Informal or draft communication, please label PROPOSED or DRAFT*, can be additionally sent to the Examiners fax phone number, (571) 273-8635.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/586,283

Page 4

Art Unit: 2128

August 14, 2011

/Saif A Alhija/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2128